UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,659	01/02/2002	Tanya Couch	SVL920010074US1/2304P	6531

45728   7590   04/30/2009
IBM ST-SVL
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
2465 E. Bayshore Road, Suite No. 406
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
BETIT, JACOB F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@sawyerlawgroup.com

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   In response to communications filed on 21 January 2009, claim 1 is amended per

applicant's request. Claims 1, 3-19, 21-24, and 91-92 are presently pending in the application.

2.   In response to the applicant's comments towards the cancellation of claims 25-90, it is

noted that these claims were cancelled in the amendment dated 4 March 2008 and were not

cancelled in the Amendment dated 21 January 2009 as the applicant states.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, and 91-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in

view of Meier et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,058,393) and Carpenter ("User Defined Functions",

sqlteam.com, printed on 27 April 2009, archived on 20 November 2000, published 12 October

2000, 7 pages).

        As to claim 1, Drexter teaches a method for converting messaging data into a relational

table format in a database system, wherein the messaging data being within a messaging system

(see page 1, paragraph 0002), the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing a plurality of table formatting specifications (see page 2, paragraph 0029), wherein the plurality of table formatting specifications comprises at least a table function name (see paragraph 0034, "naming the database association"), a location of a messaging system queue, (see paragraph 0034, "selecting an email folder"), a messaging data format, (see paragraph 0034, "identify and select email messages that are of a particular format or formats"), a column name (see paragraph 0035, "selecting a database field") and data type (see paragraph 0066, "assuring proper formatting for a database application that receives currency amounts to the nearest penny"), and an option for saving specifications for future use (see paragraph 0034, "retrieve, recall or otherwise facilitate reuse of a particular database association");

(b) utilizing the plurality of table formatting specifications to automatically build a table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034); and

(c1) invoking the table function to access the messaging data (see pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033); and

(c2) converting the messaging data into relational table format according to the plurality of table formatting specifications (c3) populating a relational table within the database system with the converted messaging data (see page 3, paragraph 0033).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing a table function in the database system, and invoking the table function from within the database system through a single database language statement.

Meier et al. teaches this, see column 2, line 33 through column 3, line 42. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have modified <u>Drexter</u> to include the teachings of <u>Meier et al.</u> because the location of

the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked

to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of

the database and to be invoked using a language statement of the database to produce the same

predictable results.

 Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace

that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g.,

Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co., 396 U.S. 57 (1969); Richardson-Vicks

Inc. v. Upjohn Co., 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

 <u>Drexter</u> as modified, still does not disclose the plurality of table formatting specifications

comprising a table function type and an option of creating a table view.

 However, <u>Carpenter</u> teaches this, see page 1, "scalar, inline table-valued and multi-

statement table-valued functions" and see page 3, "Inline Table-Value user-defined function

returns a table data type". Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to have modified <u>Drexter</u> as modified, to include the

teachings of <u>Carpenter</u> because these teachings would allow the user different types of user

defined functions based on the data set the user was working from and the data the user wishes to

ouput.

As to claims 3, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the table function and the at least one messaging function are user-defined functions within the database system (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0034).

As to claims 4, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the at least one messaging function retrieves and reads the messaging data in the message system (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 4, paragraph 0042).

As to claims 5, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) reading the plurality of table formatting specifications from a file (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 4, paragraph 0041).

As to claims 10, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) providing formatting information about the messaging data (see <u>Drexter</u>, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033).

As to claims 11, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a1) further includes the steps of:

(a1i) designating a delimiter character, wherein the delimiter character separates the messaging data into column data (see <u>Drexter</u>, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As to claims 12, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the converting step (c2) further comprising:

(c2i) invoking a parser function within the database system for parsing the delimited messaging data (see <u>Drexter</u>, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As to claims 14, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a1) further includes the step of:

(a1i) specifying a fixed-length format by indicating a position (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0036) and length of each column (see <u>Drexter</u>, pages 2-3, paragraph 0030).

As to claims 15, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a2) allowing a user to view the messaging data in the messaging system to verify the formatting information provided before building the table function (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 6, paragraph 0064).

As to claims 16, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the messaging data comprises a message string, the message string including a plurality of substrings, wherein each substring represents data that is returned as a column in a table (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0037, where "column" is read on "field").

As to claims 17, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) defining a column for each substring of the plurality of substrings in the message string (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claims 22, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) allowing a user to create and name a table view based on the table formatting specifications (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037).

As to claims 23, as modified, <u>Drexter</u> teaches wherein the invoking step (c) further includes the step of:

(c1i) selecting messaging data from the table view (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claim 24, as modified, <u>Drexter</u> teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) allowing a user to review a summary of the table formatting specifications before building the table function (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0035-0036).

As to claim 91, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the single database language statement is a single structured query language (SQL) statement (see <u>Meier et al.</u> column 2, line 33 through column 3, line 42).

As to claim 92, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the allowing step (a1) further includes the step of:

(a1i)   allowing the user to view the table formatting specifications as database language statements before building the table function (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0035-0036).

5.   Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Drexter</u> (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of <u>Meier et al.</u> and <u>Carpenter</u> ("User Defined Functions", sqlteam.com, printed on 27 April 2009, archived on 20 November 2000, published 12 October 2000, 7 pages) as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, and 22-24 above, and in further view of <u>Demers et al.</u> (U.S. patent No. 5,870,761).

As to claims 6, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the steps of:

(a1) selecting a name for the table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034);

(a2) specifying where the table function is to be stored (see page 3, paragraph 0034 and see page 4, paragraph 0041).

(a3) indicating where the messaging data resides (see page 3, paragraph 0038).

<u>Drexter</u> does not teach selecting a type for the table function, wherein the type includes one of a retrieve function and a read function.

Demers et al. teaches this (see column 5, lines 4-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Demers et al. because these teachings would allow other destination sites to dequeue the record (see Demers et al., column 5, lines 4-12).

As to claims 7, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the specifying step (a2) further includes the steps of:

(a2i) providing a database name and access information; and (a2ii) allowing the user to validate the access information (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0039).

As to claims 8, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the indicating step (a3) further includes the step of:

(a3i) providing a service point name for the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0038).

As to claims 9, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the indicating step (a3) further includes the step of:

(a3i) providing a system default endpoint for the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0037).

6.   Claims 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Meier et al. and Carpenter

("User Defined Functions", sqlteam.com, printed on 27 April 2009, archived on 20 November

2000, published 12 October 2000, 7 pages) as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31,

36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of Huth et al. (U.S.

patent No. 6,704,742 B1).

As to claims 13, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the invoking step (d1) further

includes:

(c2iA) checking for the parser function within the database system (see figure 2,

reference number 42); and

(c2iC) registering the parser function in the database system after it is built to allow other

table functions to invoke the parser function (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

Drexter does not teach

(c2iB) building the parser function if it does not exist within the database system.

Huth et al. this (see column 9, lines 30-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a

person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified

Drexter to include the teachings of Huth et al. because these teachings would allow the

manipulation of data in a way that was not previously defined (see Huth et al., abstract).

7.   Claims 18, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Meier et al. and

Carpenter ("User Defined Functions", sqlteam.com, printed on 27 April 2009, archived on 20

November 2000, published 12 October 2000, 7 pages) as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-

24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of <u>Poskanzer</u>

(U.S. patent No. 6,658,426 B1).

     As to claims 18, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the defining step (a1) further

includes the steps of:

     (a1i) naming each column (see page 5, paragraph 0056)

     <u>Drexter</u> does not teach (a1ii) designating a data type for each column.

     <u>Poskanzer</u> teaches this (see column 3, lines 39-43). Therefore, It would have been

obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified <u>Drexter</u> to include the teachings of <u>Poskanzer</u> because these teachings would

determine how the SQL statement must be structured to access data relating to that field (see

<u>Poskanzer</u>, column 3, lines 39-43).

     As to claims 19, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the defining step (a1) further

includes the step of:

     (a1iii) allowing the user to view the messaging data formatted according to the column

definitions provided (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 3, paragraph 0035).

     As to claims 21, <u>Drexter</u> as modified, teaches wherein the converting step (c) further

includes:

     (d1) parsing the message string into the plurality of substrings (see <u>Drexter</u>, page 5,

paragraph 0056).

(d2) converting each substring into the designated data type corresponding to its column

(see <u>Poskanzer</u>, column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 4).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view

of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure and can be found on the attached form PTO-892.

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Bétit whose telephone number is (571)272-4075. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 10:30 am to 6:30 pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571) 272-4078. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

jfb
27 Apr 2009

/Tony Mahmoudi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169